DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 056 HE 015 334

AUTHOR Sanford, Timothy R.
TITLE Learning by Doing: One Approach to the Study of Higher Education. ASHE Annual Meeting 1982 Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 2-3, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; Course Objectives; *Higher Education; *Instructional Design; Peer Evaluation; *Postsecondary Education As a Field of Study; *Student Developed Materials; Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; United States; *University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

ABSTRACT

A teacher's experiences in teaching higher education in the United States during the 1981 fall semester at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill are discussed. The course is an introductory course for graduate students in the higher and adult education doctoral program, but it also attracts students from throughout the university and nearby institutions. A new approach was used for the fall 1981 semester: students learned about higher education by designing a course. The weekly classroom activities were not markedly different from other semesters, but the main goal of the course directed students to come up with a coherent and comprehensive course on Higher Education in the United States. Classroom activities included oral presentations by students, which other students evaluated. Students assigned a grade individually and the average was the grade for the presentation. While one exam was prepared and graded by the instructor, the second was individually designed and taken by the students. The instructor graded both the content of the second exam and the questions posed. The final variation from the usual course conduct was the ultimate product: an outline of a course entitled, "Higher Education in the U.S." In addition, five evaluations of the course were provided by the students: on the first day of class; after the first exam; half way through the course; an instructor-designed evaluation at the end of the course; and a computerized school-wide evaluation. Copies of the evaluation forms and actual responses are appended, along with a course outline that specifies course objectives, requirements, tests, and reading assignments. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219056

LEARNING BY DOING: ONE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Timothy R. Sanford
Associate Director of Institutional Research
Lecturer in Education
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
02 South Bldg. 005A
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

HE 015 334

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 2-3, 1982.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Timothy R. Sanford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Association for the Study of Higher Education

The George Washington University / One Dupont Circle, Suite 630 / Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C. March 2-3, 1982. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Annual Meeting — March 2-3, 1982 — Washington Hilton
Washington, D.C

Learning by Doing: One Approach to the Study of Higher Education

This paper discusses the author's experiences in teaching Higher Education in the United States during the 1981 fall semester at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The course is an introductory course for graduate students in the Higher and Adult Education Doctoral Program, but it also attracts students from throughout the University and nearby institutions. Most students come to the course from professional positions in colleges and universities rather than straight from their undergraduate work. The author had taught the course three semesters previously, but this was the first time for this approach.

The basic strategy which was different in the 1981 semester and which is the subject of this paper was that the students learned about higher education by designing a course on the same topic. While the weekly classroom activities were not markedly different from other semesters, the overarching goal of the course directed students towards the development of their own course. Underlying every reading they did, every paper they wrote, every test they took was the need to put it all together to come up with a coherent and comprehensive course, Higher Education in the United States.

Background

There were three reasons which prompted the use of this type of format for the course. First, some novelty is always desirable, if not necessary, as one teaches the same course year after year. Not only can the instructor become bored and, hence, less interesting, less enthusiastic, and less effective, but the students, also, may suffer through the declining involvement of the instructor. Additionally, it seems plausible that students could enjoy a different instructional approach in similar fashion to the instructor. Previous attempts

at modifications in the course had been reasonably effective, but greater change seemed necessary.

Second, the author had noticed that his knowledge and awareness of the field of higher education had increased through teaching the subject, so it seemed reasonable to conclude that students might also be able to learn through the same technique. The problem that the students did not start from the same knowledge base as the instructor was real but did not seem to be a serious dilemma.

Third, the pursuit of learning happens in a variety of ways which go beyond taking lecture notes, discussing the issues in class, taking exams, and writing papers. Certainly novelty can enter in here, but the underlying premise suggests that students can learn by composing exams as well as taking them, from selecting textbooks as well as reading them (which, of course, is inherent in the selection process), and giving grades as well as getting graded.

Thus, the objectives were twofold: to revitalize the author's interest in teaching the course and to improve the students' learning about higher education.

There is another element which, also, enters in and that is the necessity for students who are contemplating careers in higher education to gain experience in teaching and course design. As a field of study, higher education is not immune to the oft-heard criticism that doctoral programs turn out research Ph.D.'s with no idea of how to perform in the classroom. Teaching is demanding work and students deserve, and usually desire, instruction and experience in it. The author makes no claim for conducting an intensive course on college teaching, but one of the goals of the altered format for the course was increased emphasis on teaching skills. In particular did the author wish to give students direct experience in grading.

The process of grading student work pervades the domain of the college professor, but one rarely finds any literature or much discussion on the subject. Certainly there has been a wealth of material on grade inflation, the pass/fail

option, and the social psychology of the "F", but how does one really tell the difference between an A and a B or, even worse, between an A^- and a B^+? Tradition suggests that this ability descends upon the college teacher along with the bestowing of the Ph.D. mantle, but experience shows that grading is a painful process for the professor as well as the student and that it is permeated with uncertainty except in the most straight-forward of exams. In short, prospective professionals in the field need experience in assigning, defending, and explaining grades.

The Course

A copy of the course outline is included as Appendix A, and readers are referred to it for a more complete description of the course. In general the course proceeded in a fashion similar to most graduate courses. The weekly three hour meetings consisted primarily of lecture and discussion, but student presentations consumed about half of each session towards the end of the semester. Actually, the student presentations turned out to be one of the more interesting aspects of the course although for unanticipated reasons.

The author uses oral classroom presentations by students for several reasons. First, students need to practice the skills involved in making an effective oral presentation because they will need these skills in most careers in the field. Second, the presentations introduce some variety into the classroom and make students more active participants in the learning process. Third, this format both forces students to study some area of higher education with some intensity and allows students to focus on some topic which may be of special interest to them. Fourth and finally, not only are oral presentations less tedious to grade than papers, but students also tend to dislike them so they must be good for them.

In a slightly more serious vein, the class presentations were altered slightly to make them student graded as well as presented; a copy of the evaluation form is included as Appendix B. Students assigned a grade individually and the average was the grade for the presentation; the instructor participated only in the event of a

tie. This grading process turned out to be a major bugaboo for the class on several occasions. For instance, one student had interviewed the president of the state community college system, and his presentation consisted almost entirely of playing a tape recording of this interview. Another student brought in a past president of AAUP (he lived nearby) for a discussion on faculty tenure and unions. The discussion was fascinating but the student did not utter a single word after introducing the guest. The student graders had real troubles coping with such presentations and assigning grades, but it appeared that learning was taking place and greater awareness of the grading process was the result.

Students in the course had two exams during the semester. The first one was prepared and graded by the instructor while the second was individually designed and taken by the students. The instructor graded both the content of the second exam and the questions posed. Future repetitions of this approach probably will not have the students take the tests they design as this seems overly redundant and instructionally unnecessary. Having students design an exam, however, worked very well as the students were quite enthusiastic about the project and their questions reflected careful preparation and knowledge of the subject matter.

The final variation from usual course conduct was the ultimate product--an outline of a course entitled, "Higher Education in the U.S." As can be seen from the outline (Appendix A), the students were to prepare a basic course outline with the major addition being a rationale for their work. Considerable flexibility was allowed for them to be creative, and emphasis was placed on the content of the course rather than on the framework within which it took place.

The students were bothered quite a bit by this assignment, and it became clear as the deadline for the outlines approached that partial blame for the students' confusion lay with the instructor. As mentioned earlier, this was the first time the author had used this approach, and his expectations simply were not clear and were not communicated adequately to the students. Future attempts should pro-

ceed more smoothly, but any reader considering such a technique would be wise to plan in detail and well in advance.

As an instructional technique, though, the course outline turned out rather well. Final products spanned a wide range of knowledge, competence, and effort but were, for the most part, of good quality. To summarize briefly, the students had given alot of thought to the development of their courses and justified the author's expectations.

Evaluation

This section deals with five evaluations of the course provided by the students and the author's subjective impressions. The reader should realize that the evaluations reported here are neither systemmatic nor particularly scientific; but, they are interesting and informative. The student evaluations will be discussed first; copies of the evaluation forms are included as Appendix C.

On the first day of class, a short evaluation was distributed at the end of the session to gather students' initial impressions of the new course format. General student reaction can be summed up in the phrase, cautious interest, but they, at least, seemed willing to give the course a try. Actual responses are included in the Appendix, page C-1.

The second evaluation was conducted one month into the course after the first exam. Student comments indicated that they still were reserving final judgement about the course format, that the reading load was a bit excessive, that the exam was fair, and that the course was going reasonably well.

Half way through the course came the third evaluation, and opinions were being expressed more concretely. Students were finding the grading of each other's presentations difficult; they felt that too much time was being spent discussing administrative details (grading, the course outline, my expectations, etc.); they felt the instructor was too authoritarian and the workload was excessive;

and they chastized each other for giving dull classroom presentations. There were spots of sunshine, however, in that students felt the course was interesting, class time was usually well-spent, and the different course format was a learning experience.

The last two evaluations were done at the end of the course; one was a computerized schoolwide evaluation and the other was designed by the instructor just as the previous three had been. Looking at the homemade one first, students definitely found the course challenging and the course outline a worthwhile learning experience. They were divided on the usefulness of the student presentations in class and on the oppressiveness of the workload. On the computerized evaluation, a wealth of data were gathered and are available in the Appendix, but particular attention is addressed to 2 questions which are particularly germane to this paper. In expressing the extent of their agreement/disagreement with the statement, "The format of this course is appropriate to course purposes," six students agreed and five students were undecided. On the other statement, "The teaching strategy used in this course is appropriate," five students agreed, four were undecided, and one disagreed. Certainly not negative, but one can hardly interpret these findings as overwhelmingly positive.

In looking back over the course myself, there are a number of positive changes which will improve the course in the future, but my overall impression is positive. Students learned from the course, but more importantly they learned both about the content of the field of higher education and, from personal experience, about the processes which make up the operation of higher learning. The course outline appears to be an excellent learning tool as long as it is not adopted widely. Student grading of presentations is not popular but appears to be a meaningful if somewhat painful experience. To me, it is very important that students (and all of us, for that matter) grapple with the issue of quality and

grading each other's work is one way to do that. Composing exams, on the other hand, is very popular and is equally of value as a classroom exercise. In short, my techniques turned out pretty well even though my approach was seat-of-the-pants.

Conclusion

The value of this paper and the work reported therein remain to be seen. The purpose for this presentation was to share an instructional approach which was novel, to the author anyway, to relate the success and problems with the techniques which were described here, and to focus my own thoughts on my teaching. I hope that this has been useful to you, but I know that it has been very instructive to me. By going through this exercise, I am more knowledgeable about myself as a teacher and about what I try to accomplish in class.

Speaking as a relative novice in college teaching and as one who is primarily an administrator (90% in institutional research), teaching is very demanding work if one tries to do it well. Yet, it is important, meaningful, and rewarding work. It deserves our best efforts, and that is the direction in which I hope this paper will push us if only a little.

COURSE OUTLINE

EDCI 261 Higher Education in the United States
Fall Semester 1981, Wednesday 2:00-4:50, Peabody 204

Instructor: Dr. Timothy R. Sanford
Office of Institutional Research
02 South Building 005A (962-3071)

Course Objectives:

-To acquaint you with the historical context of higher education in the United States.

-To introduce you to the relationship(s) between higher education and society.

-To promote your understanding of complex issues surrounding and involving higher education.

-To challenge you to think about higher education in the U.S.

Course Requirements:

-Two brief essays (20%)

-Paper--detailed course outline (20%)

-Active participation in class and devoted study of assigned readings (20%)

-Two written exams (20%)

-Presentation in class (20%)

Texts for the Course: (available at UNC Student Stores)

-Trends in American Higher Education by Joseph Ben-David

-On Higher Education by David Riesman

Reserve Readings: (Reserve Desk, Undergraduate Library)

1. Jencks & Riesman, The Academic Revolution (LA226 .J4)
2. Bell & Stub, The Sociology of Education (LC191 .B4)
3. Riley & Baldridge, Governing Academic Organizations (LB 2341 .G65)
4. Toynbee & Gardner reprints (xx - 9169)
5. Ashby, "The Structure of Higher Education: A World View" (xx - 9170)
6. O'Toole, "Tenure: A Conscientious Objection" (xx - 9172)
7. Van Alstyne, "Tenure: A Conscientious Objective" (xx - 9173)

8. Pifer, "Working Women: Toward a New Society" (xx - 9174)

9. Perkins, "Reform of Higher Education: Mission Impossible" (xx-9175)

10. Astin, Four Critical Years (LC 238 .A84)

11. Change, The Third Century (LA 212 .T47)

12. Gross & Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (LD2331 .G76)

13. Karabel & Halsey, Power and Ideology in Education (LC191 .P66)

14. Sanford, "The College Curriculum: Past and Future" (xx-1815)

15. Conrad & Wyer, "Liberal Education: A Dynamic Tradition" (xx-1810)

16. Gross, "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?" (xx-1811)

17. Mulkeen, "Higher Education in the Coming Age of Limits: An Historical Perspective" (xx-1814)

18. Johnson, "Misconceptions About the Early Land-Grant Colleges" (xx-1812)

19. Sanders, "The University of North Carolina: Structure and Organization" (xx-1816)

20. Jonsen, "Small Liberal Arts Colleges: Diversity at the Crossroads" (xx-1813)

Recommended Regular Reading:

The Chronicle of Higher Education
Change Magazine
The Journal of Higher Education
Research in Higher Education
The Review of Higher Education

Class Presentation:

Each member of the class will make a presentation to the class on a topic germane to the day's discussion. Topics must be approved in advance and the date of the presentation will fall between September 30 and December 9; dates will be drawn randomly in the first class. The length of your presentation is expected to be between 60 and 90 minutes with the format up to you; creativity is encouraged but not required. An outline of the main points of the presentation with assigned readings (if any, one hour limit) must be ready to be handed out in class the week before your presentation is scheduled. Grades will be assigned by the class with the instructor voting only in the event of a tie. Your suggested topic must be turned in on Sept. 9; it will be returned at the end of class that day.

Paper--Detailed Course Outline:

The on-going focus of this course is your learning about higher education through the development of a course entitled, "Higher Education in the United States." You will do this individually and in lieu of a paper. Note that all of the other requirements for this course, with the possible exception of the exam I shall prepare, are designed around this focus. Thus, I ask you to consider all your work in this course from this perspective -- you are to learn about Higher Education in the U.S. by designing a course on that subject.

The end product which you will turn in (proudly) on December 2 should reflect your knowledge of higher education. (Note that a brief, preliminary outline is due Nov. 4.) The only major change from any regular course outline or description will be that yours will show more detail by giving me some indication of your reasons for including what you show on the outline. Without going to extremes, I expect to see your rationale for your outline in addition to the outline itself. While I believe that it is possible to do this in a superficial manner, I also believe that this would be apparent to me and I know that it would be reflected in your final grade.

Essays:

The two essays will be on topics of your choosing and will be typed double-spaced on 3 to 5 pages. A good example of the type of essay that I have in mind is the "Point of View" section found on the last page of the Chronicle of Higher Education. Due dates for the essays are October 7 and November 18 although you are welcome to turn them in early.

Exams:

There will be two, hourly exams. The first one will follow tradition in that I shall prepare it and you shall take it; this will occur on Sept. 23. There will be some choice in the questions you will be expected to answer.

The second exam will break partially from tradition in that you will prepare the exam; however, we shall then adhere to tradition in that you will also take the exam. This will occur on Oct. 28. The format of the exam you prepare is up to you, but the exam must be prepared before you come to class on the date of the exam. I shall grade the exam both on the basis of your answers and on the exam itself.

General Notes:

Honor Code - All of your graded work will be done within the Honor Code. No references of any kind may be used for the exams, and the usual guidelines for doing scholarly work will be expected on the course outline and class presentation (i.e., if you use someone else's work, give them credit for it).

Grades - You are all capable of doing work at the P level (entirely satisfactory) or you would not be here. If your work falls short of the P level, I will try to work with you as much as you desire. If your work is clearly outstanding (H), in my opinion, I shall be pleased to recognize it.

Class Attendance and Participation - Class attendance is entirely at your discretion, but you cannot get a satisfactory grade on participation if you are never here.

Readings - The reading load is significant but you should be able to judge the difference between passages that require close study and those that can be skimmed lightly. We will not discuss all readings in class but that does not mean that you can skip those readings or that you should not raise questions about such readings in class.

Office Hours - Generally I am in my office in 02 South Building from 8:00 to 5:00, Monday - Friday. Feel free to drop in or call ahead of time.

Schedule of Classes with Assigned Readings

August 26 Introduction; The Sanford Perspective on Higher Education
Readings: Ben-David ch. 1-3, Johnson, Jencks & Riesman ch. 1

September 2 Conceptual Aids; Early History of American Higher Education
Readings: Ben-David ch. 4-5, Sanford, Conrad & Wyer

September 9 The Undergraduate Years; Liberal Arts Education; College Curriculum
Readings: Ben-David ch. 6, Jencks & Riesman ch. 12

September 16 Research vs. Teaching; The University; Graduate Education
Readings: Ben-David ch. 7, Mulkeen, Ashby, Riesman ch. 1-2

September 23 First hourly exam - Instructor's

September 30 The Current State of Higher Education
Readings: Riesman ch. 6, Bell & Stub ch. 22, Karabel & Halsey ch. 11

October 7 First essay due. Community Colleges
Readings: Bell & Stub ch. 13, Pifer, Karabel & Halsey ch. 36, Jencks & Riesman ch. 3

October 14 Higher Education and Society; Meritocracy
Readings: Riesman ch. 3,4,7,8,9, Jencks & Riesman ch. 2

October 21 College Students; Student Consumerism
Readings: Riesman ch. 5, O'Toole, Van Alstyne

October 28 Second hourly exam - Your's

November 4 Preliminary course outline due. College Faculty Issues: Tenure, Unions, Publish or Perish
Readings: Riesman ch. 10-11, Riley & Baldridge ch. 1 & 6, Gross & Grambsch ch. 1 & 6, Sanders

November 11 Governance and Administration in Higher Education
Readings: Jencks & Riesman ch. 6, Jonsen

November 18 Second essay due. Public and Private Higher Education; The Size of the University
Readings: Gross, Astin ch. 1,8,9

November 25 Thanksgiving vacation - no class.

December 2 Course outline due. Today's colleges and universities
Readings: Perkins, Change pp. 24-32, 90-97, 188-196

December 9 (Final exam period) The Future of Higher Education

Appendix B

EDCI 261 Class Project Evaluation Form

Presenter's Name _____

Evaluator's Name _____

Please use the following codes to evaluate the four areas of the presentation shown below:

O = Outstanding F = Fair

G = Good P = Poor

	Evaluation Code
1. Personal Style	_____
2. Coverage of Material	_____
3. Format of Presentation	_____
4. Level of Interest	_____

Overall Grade

Please circle one grade as your overall evaluation of this presenter.

H P L F

Constructive Comments for the Presenter:

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF EDCI 261 - Higher Education in the United States - Fall 1981

The following questions are designed to elicit your immediate reaction to this course as you currently understand it. Your completion of this evaluation form is totally optional and anonymous. This is for my own use and will have no bearing on your grade in the course.

1. Overall, how does the course look to you? (check one response)

   3 Great, can't wait to get started!
   9 Seems like it might be interesting.
   2 I'll survive.
   ___ How do you drop a course!?!

2. What do you think of the idea of designing a course on the subject as a way of learning about the subject?

   3 Flash of brilliance; truly creative teaching idea!
   8 Could be interesting.
   ___ Nothing new.
   1 Sounds like an easy way to get your course set up for next year.

3. What do you think of the workload/course requirements?

   ___ A snap!
   5 Par for the course.
   7 Tough but fair.
   2 Don't you think we have anything else to do!?!

4. Additional comments:

Higher Education in the U.S. - Class Evaluation

Please answer honestly the following questions in the space provided; use the back if you need more space. You do not have to do this; your name is optional. Thanks for your help! Please turn this in with your exam.

What do you think of the course so far in terms of:

Amount of work required?

Texts used?

The exam?

The format of the course?

The use of class time?

My overall performance?

Do you have any suggestions to improve the course?

Other comments?

EDCI 261 ----- Higher Education in the U.S.

Class Evaluation

This is voluntary and anonymous, but your honest comments are desired. Please return with your exam, drop it off at my office, or send it through campus mail. Thanks.

1. Overall I find the course:

4	Interesting
3	Okay
____	Disappointing

Comments:

2. The class presentations are:

____	Useful
7	Some good, some bad
____	A waste of time

Comments:

3. I find the required course outline:

____	Stimulating
5	A learning experience
2	Confusing
1	Irrelevant

Comments:

4. Class time is usually:

4	Well-spent
2	A long 3 hours

Comments:

5. I think the course needs:

2	More lecture
6	More discussion
1	Less lecture
0	Less discussion
4	Fewer class presentations

Comments:

CONTINUE ON BACK

6. In my opinion the course:

2 Is great
5 Is okay
1 Needs work

Comments:

7. In relation to the course, I feel:

3 Comfortable
2 Uneasy
___ Bored

Comments:

General Comments:

EDCI 261 Higher Education in the U.S. Final Course Evaluation 12/9/81

As in the past, please complete this evaluation form voluntarily, honestly, and anonymously. I am undecided about my own evaluation of the course, so I really would appreciate your candid comments if you care to share them.

I. Overall, what did you think of the course? (Was it boring, too much work, challenging, etc.?)

II. Now that you have completed your course outline, how do you feel about it as a course requirement and learning experience?

III. Has your opinion of the class projects changed since the last evaluation in which people were fairly negative? If so, what do you think of them now?

IV. What about class time in general? Was it well-spent, too rushed, too much lecture, etc.?

V. Regarding the course content, do you feel that it was reasonably comprehensive? Did we spend too much time on some topics, not enough time on others? Do you feel you learned about higher education as you may have anticipated?

VI. Other comments --

	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	MEAN	MEDIAN
----- MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:							
MY INSTRUCTOR DISPLAYS A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF COURSE TOPICS.	6	5	0	0	0	4.5	4.6
MY INSTRUCTOR HAS AN EFFECTIVE STYLE OF PRESENTATION.	2	5	2	0	2	3.5	3.8
MY INSTRUCTOR SEEMS WELL-PREPARED FOR CLASS.	6	3	0	2	0	4.2	4.6
MY INSTRUCTOR STIMULATES INTEREST IN THE COURSE.	1	7	2	1	0	3.7	3.9
THIS COURSE HAS BEEN INTELLECTUALLY FULFILLING FOR ME.	2	6	1	2	0	3.7	3.9
MY INSTRUCTOR HAS STIMULATED MY THINKING.	1	9	0	1	0	3.9	4.0
MY INSTRUCTOR HAS PROVIDED MANY CHALLENGING NEW VIEWPOINTS.	0	6	3	2	0	3.4	3.6
THIS COURSE STRETCHED AND BROADENED MY VIEWS GREATLY.	1	5	3	2	0	3.5	3.6
MY INSTRUCTOR EMPHASIZES RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AND AMONG TOPICS.	1	9	0	1	0	3.9	4.0
MY INSTRUCTOR EMPHASIZES CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF MATERIAL.	1	5	4	1	0	3.5	3.6
MY INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVELY BLENDS FACTS WITH THEORY.	0	5	3	2	1	3.1	3.3
MY INSTRUCTOR IS ACTIVELY HELPFUL WHEN STUDENTS HAVE PROBLEMS.	1	8	0	2	0	3.7	3.9
MY INSTRUCTOR EVALUATES OFTEN AND PROVIDES HELP WHERE NEEDED.	2	7	0	2	0	3.8	4.0
I WAS ABLE TO KEEP UP WITH THE WORK LOAD IN THIS COURSE.	5	3	0	2	1	3.8	4.3
A TEACHER/STUDENT PARTNERSHIP IN LEARNING IS ENCOURAGED.	2	6	2	1	0	3.8	3.9
I AM FREE TO EXPRESS AND EXPLAIN MY OWN VIEWS IN CLASS.	4	7	0	0	0	4.4	4.3
I FEEL FREE TO ASK QUESTIONS IN CLASS.	4	5	2	0	0	4.2	4.2
MY INSTRUCTOR RESPECTS CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM.	2	5	3	1	0	3.7	3.8
I FEEL FREE TO CHALLENGE MY INSTRUCTORS IDEAS IN CLASS.	3	6	1	1	0	4.0	4.1
MY INSTRUCTOR DEALS FAIRLY AND IMPARTIALLY WITH ME.	3	5	1	0	2	3.6	4.0
I HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO HELP DETERMINE COURSE OBJECTIVES.	0	3	1	4	3	2.4	2.1
THE COURSE CONTENT IS CONSISTENT WITH MY PRIOR EXPECTATIONS.	1	7	0	2	1	3.5	3.9
THIS COURSE MATERIAL IS PERTINENT TO MY PROFESSIONAL TRAINING.	3	4	3	0	0	4.0	4.0
THE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS COURSE TO MY EDUCATION IS APPARENT.	4	5	2	0	0	4.2	4.2
THE CONTENT OF THIS COURSE IS RELEVANT TO MY NEEDS.	2	6	2	1	0	3.8	3.9
MY INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPS CLASSROOM DISCUSSION SKILLFULLY.	0	5	3	2	0	3.3	3.5
ONE REAL STRENGTH OF THIS COURSE IS THE CLASSROOM DISCUSSION.	0	6	3	2	0	3.4	3.6
CHALLENGING QUESTIONS ARE RAISED FOR DISCUSSION.	0	7	1	3	0	3.4	3.7
MY FINAL GRADE WILL ACCURATELY REFLECT MY OVERALL PERFORMANCE.	1	5	4	1	0	3.5	3.6
MY INSTRUCTOR HAS A REALISTIC DEFINITION OF GOOD PERFORMANCE.	1	3	5	2	0	3.3	3.2
THE ASSIGNED READINGS SIGNIFICANTLY CONTRIBUTE TO THIS COURSE.	3	5	2	1	0	3.9	4.0
LENGTH AND DIFFICULTY OF ASSIGNED READINGS ARE REASONABLE.	3	3	0	5	0	3.4	3.7
ASSIGNMENTS ARE OF DEFINITE INSTRUCTIONAL VALUE.	3	7	1	0	0	4.2	4.1
THE NUMBER OF COURSE ASSIGNMENTS IS REASONABLE.	3	5	0	3	0	3.7	4.0
STUDENT PRESENTATIONS SIGNIFICANTLY CONTRIBUTE TO THIS COURSE.	2	2	1	5	1	2.9	2.4
THE FORMAT OF THIS COURSE IS APPROPRIATE TO COURSE PURPOSES.	0	6	5	0	0	3.5	3.6
THE TEACHING STRATEGY USED IN THIS COURSE IS APPROPRIATE.	0	5	4	1	0	3.4	3.5
I HIGHLY RECOMMEND THIS COURSE.	0	4	5	2	0	3.2	3.2
I LIKE THE WAY THE INSTRUCTOR CONDUCTS THIS COURSE.	1	3	5	2	0	3.3	3.2
MY INSTRUCTOR IDENTIFIES MAJOR OR IMPORTANT POINTS IN THE COURSE.	1	9	1	0	0	4.0	4.0